DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 843 FL 021 420

AUTHOR Sikogukira, Matutin
TITLE Influence of Languages Other than the L1 on a Foreign Language: A Case of Transfer from L2 to L3.
REPORT NO ISSN-0959-2253
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 25p.; For serial publication in which this paper appears, see FL 021 410.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT Edinburgh Working Papers in Applied Linguistics; v4 p110-132 1993

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; *French; Language Proficiency; Language Research; *Second Language Learning; *Transfer of Training
IDENTIFIERS *Cognates

ABSTRACT

Most research on language transfer has been conducted on the first and second language. This paper describes a case of transfer from the second language to the third language, specifically the influence of French (L2) on the learning of English (L3). The study focuses on French-English lexical cognates and suggests that although the learners perceive French and English as closely related, they do not adopt a wholesale transfer strategy. Their assessment of the transferability of the cognates seems to depend on such factors as the category of cognates, the sense relations holding between cognates and other semantically related lexemes, and the learners' level of proficiency. (Author/JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 360 843

INFLUENCE OF LANGUAGES OTHER THAN THE L1 ON A FOREIGN LANGUAGE: A CASE OF TRANSFER FROM L2 TO L3

MATUTIN SIKOGUKIRA (DAL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
BRIAN PARKINSON
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL021420

INFLUENCE OF LANGUAGES OTHER THAN THE L1 ON A FOREIGN LANGUAGE: A CASE OF TRANSFER FROM L2 TO L3

Matutin Sikogukira (DAL)

Abstract

The phenomenon of transfer in language learning has mostly been investigated with reference to L1 and L2. This paper describes a case of transfer from L2 to L3, specifically the influence of French (L2) on the learning of English (L3). The study focuses on French-English lexical cognates and suggests that although the learners perceive French and English as closely related, they do not adopt a wholesale transfer strategy. Their assessment of the transferability of the cognates seems to depend on such factors as the category of cognates, the sense relations holding between cognates and other semantically related lexemes, and the learners' level of proficiency.

1. Introduction

One aspect of language transfer which, though not wholly neglected in recent literature, has nevertheless not yet captured the attention of most SLA researchers is that of the influence of languages other than the L1 on the target language. Most research on language transfer seems to assume that the natural route of transfer is from L1 to L2. Very little attention has been paid to the question of the extent to which languages other than the L1 influence the learning of an additional language. The way a learner with previous knowledge of another language acquires a new language will differ in some respects from that of monolingual learners in the same learning situation, with the same mother tongue and the same socio-psychological characteristics. Thomas's (1988) study, for instance, suggests that bilinguals learning a third language seem to have developed a sensitivity to language as a system which helps them perform better in those activities usually associated with formal language learning than monolinguals learning a foreign language for the first time. She argues that bilinguals who have formally acquired an L2 have developed a conscious awareness of language as a system that provides them with additional advantages over monolinguals and that their metalinguistic awareness may increase the potential advantage of knowing two languages when learning a third. Her findings also show that bilingual students learning a third language outperform monolingual students learning a second language.

There is wide agreement among SLA researchers whose work is centred on cross-linguistic influence that transfer (both positive and negative) is more likely to take place from a language which is related to the new foreign language being learned (see Corder 1979; James 1977; Kellerman 1987; Lightbown and Libben 1984; Nababan 1981; Ringbom 1978, 1986, 1987; Sweet 1964; Vildomec 1963). One researcher whose main interest is the notion of language similarity is Kellerman (1977, 1986, 1987). He argues for the psychotypology hypothesis, that is to say, the amount of transfer that a

second language learner will attempt is determined in large measure by the learner's perception of the distance and the degree of relatedness and similarity between the source language and target language. According to him, learners may develop a notion of typological distance between the two languages by perceiving the source language as more or less distant from the target language. This perceived distance between the two languages together with the learner's fragmentary knowledge about a specific structural domain of the target language will allow the learner to make a prediction of the transferability of a source language feature.

If we assume that L2 influence on L3 is a reality, why is it, then, that L3 learners should be more ready to transfer from their L2 than from their L1? Corder (1979:33) points out that 'other languages known to the learner, however imperfectly, may, in the degree to which they resemble the target language, have a facilitating effect'. He goes on to argue that this assumption is supported by the general observation that 'the more languages one knows, the easier the acquisition of yet another appears to be' because in such a case 'the learner has a large number of "ready-made" hypotheses to test in processing the data of the new language'. He concludes that the magnitude of the task of learning an L2 which is related to one's L1 is much smaller than that of learning an unrelated language. He contends that where the mother tongue is formally similar to the target language the learner will pass more rapidly along the developmental continuum (or some parts of it), whereas in the case of unrelated (distant) languages the speed will be slower because of the differences along the whole continuum. Citing the example of Indonesian learners of English who transfer from their previously learned Dutch, in the areas of lexis and grammar, Nababan (1971) also claims that L2-L3 influence is common when the two languages are cognates.

Transfer of linguistic structures from the language which has greater resemblance to the target language among those known to a multilingual learner, rather than from his L1, has been referred to as 'the base language hypothesis' (Chandrasekhar 1978). He maintains that if a learner is multilingual, it is not always the mother tongue which interferes with the learning process but it may be another language. He contends that if the new language has greater resemblance to one of the languages known to the learner other than the mother tongue, it is from that language that transfer takes place and the possibilities of errors have to be determined by a contrastive analysis of this language and the new foreign language. This language from which transfer takes place, he calls 'the base language'. Tenjoh-Okwen's (1985) analysis of the interlanguages of francophone Cameroonian learners of English suggests that 44% of the deviant forms from the corpus analysed are attributable to French, 'the base language', and not to the learners' mother tongues.

The best-known work in the area of lexis is that carried out in Finland with bilingual Finnish-Swedish population. The name often associated with this research in this region is that of Ringbom (1978, 1983, 1986, 1987), whose analysis shows that the Finnish-Swedish learners of English as a foreign language significantly make more errors which are attributable to Swedish, than Finnish, irrespective of whether their L1 is Swedish or Finnish. He argues that Finnish learners of English rarely 'borrow' from Finnish; they prefer to 'borrow' from Swedish although they may resort to Finnish rather than Swedish when it is a question of a word's 'semantic field'. Ringbom (1978 : 96) stresses that it is sometimes claimed that when one speaks an L3 or an L4, influence from other foreign languages is much more apparent than L1 influence. He notes, however, that this view has so far been based on anecdotal evidence. In another study, Ringbom (1986:156) once more underlines that the extent to which languages other than the L1

influence the learning of an additional language has not yet been substantially investigated. This issue has so far been discussed in only a few scattered articles such as Ahukana et al. (1981), Chumbow (1981), LoCoco (1976), Ringbom (1978, 1986), Ulijn et al (1981) and unpublished theses (e.g. Bentahila 1975; Tenjoh-Okwen 1985; Wickstrom 1980) which are generally confined to exploring cross-linguistic influence in the area of lexis, usually between two related languages.

Other studies appear to refute Ringbom's view that influence from languages other than the L1 seems to be insignificant in the area of grammar and non-existent in phonology. In the area of syntax, for example, Khaldi (1982), in a study of acceptability judgment tasks on relative clauses and idioms by Algerian learners of English, compares learners from a bilingual setting with learners from an Arabic setting and finds that the bilingual learners transfer from their L2 (French) rather than from their L1 (Arabic) whenever they perceive the structure as language-neutral. He also notes that bilinguals perform better on the relative clause task because French rules are closer to English than Arabic ones. In a more or less similar study, Schachter et al. (1976) find that Arabic learners who are bilingual in French reject non-native-like relative clauses (in English) which resemble Arabic but not French, pointing to a case of positive transfer resulting from the application of L2 knowledge. White (1987), on the other hand, compares English-speaking learners of French and learners of French with other mother tongues but with previous knowledge of English and finds that the latter are more likely to accept preposition stranding in French. She argues that this might be due to transfer from English. In the area of phonology, Singh and Carroll (1979) show that their Indian informants are influenced by English rather than by their Indian L1s in their pronunciation of French. There is, however, a case of counter-evidence attested by Haggis (1973), who finds that Ghanaian Twi-speakers show far more evidence of Twi (L1) than English (L2) influence in their pronunciation of French. Perhaps most studies sugggest that L2-L3 influence is attested at all levels of language.

Although L2-L3 similarity is widely argued for in the literature as the cause for L2-L3 influence, it is not the only cause. L2-L3 influence seems to be an interplay of a number of factors. Bentahila (1975) and Rivers (1979) argue for 'recency' as a possible factor. This implies that whichever foreign language was learned last will interfere with the next-learned one. Meisel (1983) posits a 'storage and retrieval' factor and suggests that L2-L3 influence could result from the possibility that the way foreign languages are stored and processed in the brain may be different from the way first languages are stored and processed, irrespective of whether they are related or not. Vildomec (1963) underlines the learning style and setting (hence 'psychological similarity') by suggesting that if two languages are learned in a similar way by a similar method or in a similar situation, and if there is a similar emotional involvement with the milieu, they may influence each other. Finally, Singh and Carroll (1979) postulate a 'socio-cultural' reason by suggesting that L3 learners may identify more strongly with an L2 than with their L1, which could result in L2 influencing their learning of an additional foreign language. Although these factors may contribute to bringing about L2-L3 transfer, to different degrees, there is a wide agreement in the literature on cross-linguistic influence that L2-L3 transfer mostly occurs between similar or related languages. Some limited counter-evidence to this view has, nonetheless, been provided by some case studies (see Haggis 1973; LoCoco 1976).

2. The present study

The present research is a case study of the transferability of lexical properties from French as an L2 to English as an L3. It rests on the fundamental assumption that the transfer potential, pattern and process are determined not only by the degree of relatedness between the learner's L1 (or any other languages known to him) and the target language, but also the learner's perception of the distance between the source language(s) and the target language.

2. 1 The context

The language situation in Burundi can be regarded as particularly favourable for investigating how the transfer phenomenon is influenced by the above mentioned two factors. As far as learning English is concerned, all students' command of English is very much a knowledge of a foreign language rather than a second language since all of them are bilingual, having Kirundi as their L1 and French as their L2. As part of my teaching experience in the Department of English Language and Literature at the University of Burundi, I have observed that Burundian students of English make a comparatively large number of semantic approximations due to transfer of the semantic structure of the L2 (French). This seems to indicate that the frequency of such lexical errors is much influenced by the relatedness of French (L2) to English (L3). There is little doubt that reliance on word form and morphemic similarities between two related languages can lead to errors, although we can only have clues to the underlying process when learners go wrong. The underlying assumption is that, by virtue of the genetic relatedness and, hence, the formal and semantic similarities between French and English lexical items, Burundian students of English transfer more readily lexical properties from French to English rather than from Kirundi to English. French here functions as the 'base language'.

2.2 The subjects

The subjects involved in this study were 126 students of the Department of English Language and Literature at the University of Burundi (50 from first year, 28 from second year, 25 from third year and 23 from fourth year, with an average age of 22, 23, 24, and 25 years respectively). There are three main reasons for choosing this particular population as subjects of the experiment.

First, they all share the same linguistic, cultural and educational background in that they have the same mother tongue (Kirundi), have been taught in French and followed the same national curriculum throughout primary and secondary education, and were raised in an exceptionally monocultural speech community. It is hoped that this homogeneity factor will increase the degree of generalisability of the results. Second, and perhaps more importantly, all the subjects have experienced the same training in English prior to their entry to the Department of English Language and Literature. They have taken English for six years in secondary education following the same national curriculum and are now attending a four year course in the above mentioned Department where the sole medium of instruction is English. Their admission to the Department is dependent on their performance in English in a national test administered at completion of secondary education whose aim is to determine the potentially best candidates for each academic discipline. Thus it is understood that the majority of them

must have achieved the best performance in English nationwide and may be regarded as the best models of the English language in the entire country.

Additionally, they have been taught English by staff who are nearly 100% locally trained nationals of Burundi who have exactly the same linguistic, cultural and educational background as the students themselves. In the Department of English Language and Literature, they continue to be taught by national academic staff, except two or three foreign staff members. The point that is being emphasized is that we are dealing with francophone learners of English who have been trained by francophone teachers, who are non-native speakers of French, in a predominantly Kirundi environment with the result of students' interlanguages being to some extent the product of their teachers' own interlanguages. This further factor may increase the chances of occurrence of 'Frenchisms' in students' performance in English.

Third, the subjects belong to four different years of study (first, second, third and fourth years), leading to the award of the degree of 'Licence' (equivalent to B.A) in English Language and Literature. Therefore they have different levels of proficiency in English. At the same time it seems that the four different levels of study could correspond to different levels of students' linguistic and metalinguistic awareness according to the structure of the Department curriculum, since some courses which are intended to enhance students' linguistic and metalinguistic awareness are postponed till students have been introduced to some other course entries. For instance, general linguistics is taught in first year, descriptive grammar and practical phonetics in second year, syntax, semantics, evolution of the English language and phonetics and phonology in third year, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and advanced topics in linguistics in fourth year. It is therefore hypothesised that the subjects' responses will vary according to the level of proficiency.

2.3 The lexical category

The lexicon is such a huge and multidimensional network that to tackle all of it within the confines of the present paper would be neither desirable nor feasible. Thus it is necessary to select and delimit a manageable lexical category that can satisfactorily attest lexical transfer from French to English. The lexical category of French-English cognates has been selected for this purpose. Not only does this category cover a large common lexicon between French and English but it is also potentially exceptionally rich for investigating the transferability of lexical properties from French to English. Moreover, it is well known that in language learning situations involving closely related languages, cognates always baffle language teachers and learners because language teaching coursebooks and textbooks generally fail to propose an appropriate methodology for the teaching and learning of cognates. As a matter of fact, cognates occur in many guises which may not always be easy for learners to identify. However, although cognates constitute nasty pitfalls in language learning, they are also a useful asset for rapid vocabulary acquisition and development of lexical knowledge.

Nevertheless, even the category of French-English cognates remains too broad a topic to be dealt with at one time. Since the major problem inherent in the use of cognates lies essentially in the assessment of their semantic overlap or semantic difference between language x and language y, it seemed appropriate that this study should concentrate on the semantics of French-English lexical cognates, and not deal with their morphology. Accordingly, two types of categories have been selected.

The first category includes French-English cognates whose meanings are the same or similar in French and English and which are in a relation of synonymy with non-cognate English lexemes (e.g. *commence, begin, start; espionage, spying*) or hyponymy (e.g. *assassinate, murder, kill; gluttony, gourmandise, greed*). By regarding cognates as cross-linguistic synonyms despite their usage differences, we accept that synonyms serve two important and complementary functions in everyday communication. First, they add flexibility to the language by enabling its users to express the same meaning by different means. Second, they add variety and expressiveness to the language by enabling its users to exercise stylistic choices in conveying the same message (see Chi-wei 1983). On the other hand, hyponymy as a semantic relation of inclusion whereby the meaning of a more specific lexeme is included in that of another more general lexeme allows the possibility of avoiding repetitions, defining or describing concepts through hyponymous substitutions. It is often argued by semanticists (e.g. Lyons 1981) that language users are likely to know the superordinate terms and their full meanings but do not necessarily know the full meanings of their corresponding hyponyms although they perceive a certain semantic link between them. In this study, it will be shown that synonymy and hyponymy are important sense relations which underly the selection and use of French-English cognates by Burundian university students of English.

The second category includes French-English cognates whose meanings differ in the two languages (e.g. *venue, siege, tutor*). This is the classic category of lexemes that most theoreticians, especially those whose work has pedagogical aims, usually have in mind when they talk of false cognates. In this study, it will be shown that this is by far the most difficult and treacherous class of cognates in the sense that learners tend to anticipate a semantic similarity where they see a formal one.

In order to minimise extraneous factors that can further obscure the phenomenon of cognateness, it is important that we limit our study to simple cognates and leave out complex cognates such as derivatives and compounds as far as possible. The latter may indeed involve different kinds of knowledge and their acquisition may therefore appear to be more complex than that of simple cognates. Although a few derived cognates which are commonly acknowledged as classic examples of French-English false cognates such as *actually* and *eventually* will be included in our data, word-formation and derivational morphology is not the concern of this study.

2.4 The hypotheses

French and English share a large common lexicon mainly as a result of the contacts the two languages have had in the course of time. Each of the two languages has borrowed words from the other, but rarely have these words kept the original meaning in the borrowing language. False cognates generally result historically from semantic shift in the sense that once a lexical item is present in two languages, its meaning can alter or diverge in various ways : it can be restricted (e.g. *commence* is used in formal contexts in English but not in French), it can be added to (e.g. *venue*, which denotes the action of coming in French, denotes the place of the action in English), etc. Language learners often have little or no training in historical linguistics and usually expect a semantic similarity where they see a formal one between pairs of cognates in two languages. Even when such a similarity does exist, learners may mistrust it and adopt an avoidance strategy by simply not venturing to use the cognates in question. The present study aims to investigate some generalisable ways in which Burundian university students of

English handle French-English cognates, that is, the factors underlying their decisions to transfer or not to transfer their knowledge of the cognates in French into English. Accordingly, the following hypotheses correspond to my predictions about the subjects' use of the above mentioned categories of French-English cognates.

Burundian university students of English will

1. show a tendency to use non-cognate English lexemes which are in a relation of either synonymy or hyponymy with French-English cognates, rather than the latter,

2. show a tendency to transfer French-English cognates whose meanings differ between French and English,

3. show a variation of their behaviour in 1 and 2 according to their knowledge of English : in both cases the tendency decreases with the increase in their level of proficiency.

2.5 The experiments

2. 5. 1 Experiment 1 : sentence completion task (see appendices A and B)

The subjects were presented with sentences in which a word was missing, and were required to supply the missing word. Although the sentences provided as much information as possible and used contexts which were familiar to the subjects to facilitate their guessing, there were risks of subjects' misunderstanding or misinterpreting the contextual and intended meaning. As a possible way to control these variables, the test was administered in two slightly different versions. The first version required the subjects to find the omitted word by relying exclusively on the information provided by the context of the sentence (see Appendix A). In the second version, the subjects were presented with the same sentences, this time with French translations for the omitted words to constrain them to make their choices within limited lexico-semantic boundaries (see Appendix B). The translations had a specific purpose because they were French-English cognates, most of the English equivalents of which were the correct words to use, and the experiment aimed at finding out whether the subjects would use the cognates or what other kinds of words they would tend to use instead.

Results

The table below presents the distribution of the words which were provided by the subjects as their answers and the percentages of the subjects who gave the words in each class. The version without French prompts will be referred to as V1 and the version with French prompts will be referred to as V2. French-English cognates are marked with a + in the table.

		year 1 (50 subjects)		year 2 (28 subjects)		year 3 (25 subjects)		year 4 (23 subjects)	
		V1	V2	V1	V2	V1	V2	V1	V2
1	misunderstanding	60	14	50	7.14	36	8	21.73	4.34
	disagreement	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	break	14	64	25	42.85	36	40	34.78	34.78
	split	0	6	3.57	14.28	0	8	0	8.69
	rupture+	4	6	14.28	35.71	20	36	39.28	47.82
	others(cut,clash)	6	10	7.14	0	8	8	4.34	4.34
2	spying	80	78	71.42	71.42	56	48	43.47	43.47
	espionage+	10	16	21.42	28.57	40	44	56.52	56.52
	others (lying, betrayal)	10	6	7.14	0	4	8	0	0
3	greed-iness	76	82	46.42	50	32	32	30.43	30.43
	behaviour	2	0	10.71	0	4	0	0	0
	over-eating	10	10	3.57	0	16	8	4.34	0
	selfishness	6	4	3.57	7.14	0	4	0	0
	gluttony+	0	2	14.28	14.28	24	28	26.08	26.08
	gourmandise+	2	2	17.85	25	20	28	34.78	43.47
	others (queerness)	4	0	3.57	3.57	4	0	4.34	0
4	left	46	12	32.14	21.42	28	24	26.08	13.04
	stopped	36	66	32.14	42.85	28	32	21.73	21.73
	interrupted+	10	20	28.57	35.71	40	44	52.17	56.52
	others (gave up)	8	2	7.14	0	4	0	0	8.69
5	loan	80	82	60.71	64.28	60	60	56.52	56.52
	credit+	16	18	32.14	32.14	36	40	43.47	43.47
	others (lending)	4	0	7.14	3.57	4	0	0	0
6	way	74	76	67.85	60.71	52	52	43.47	43.47
	road	12	12	10.71	10.71	8	8	4.34	4.34
	street	4	8	0	3.57	0	0	0	0
	route+	10	10	21.42	21.42	40	40	52.17	52.17

7	beginning	92	96	78.57	89.28	72	80	65.21	73.91
	opening	4	2	7.14	0	8	4	13.04	8.69
	start	4	2	7.14	0	8	4	4.34	0
	commencement+	0	0	7.14	10.71	12	12	17.39	17.39
8	killed	62	66	50	42.85	32	32	26.08	26.08
	murdered	16	16	17.85	28.57	28	28	26.08	26.08
	shot	12	8	7.14	0	8	4	4.34	0
	assassinated+	10	10	25	28.57	32	36	43.48	47.84
9	freed	62	62	39.28	46.42	24	28	34.78	34.78
	released	8	10	21.42	14.28	20	12	0	0
	liberated+	24	22	35.71	35.71	56	60	65.21	65.21
	others (blessed)	6	6	3.57	3.57	0	0	0	0
10	experiments	28	34	53.57	60.71	72	72	86.95	91.13
	experiences+	72	66	46.42	39.28	28	28	13.04	8.69
11	deposited+	0	6	10.71	25	32	32	39.13	39.13
	put	68	72	42.28	46.42	28	28	17.39	30.43
	kept	10	12	7.14	3.57	8	12	8.69	4.34
	saved+	16	10	17.85	17.85	24	24	30.43	26.08
	others (sent)	6	0	10.71	3.57	8	4	4.34	0
12	tiredness	64	66	53.57	53.57	32	32	26.08	26.08
	fatigue+	30	34	42.85	46.42	68	68	73.91	73.91
	others (thirst)	6	0	3.57	0	0	0	0	0
13	deposit	6	8	17.85	21.42	32	32	43.47	47.82
	caution+	84	82	60.71	71.42	48	56	52.17	47.82
	warranty	0	0	10.71	7.14	16	12	4.34	4.34
	others (sureness)	10	10	10.71	0	4	0	0	0
14	physicists	6	8	21.42	25	40	40	56.52	56.52
	physists*	0	0	3.57	7.14	16	16	8.69	13.04
	physicians+	82	90	64.28	64.28	40	44	17.39	21.73
	scientists	10	2	3.57	3.57	4	0	17.39	8.69
	o hers (scholars)	2	0	7.14	0	0	0	0	0
15	deranged+	0	6	10.71	10.71	20	20	26.08	34.78
	disturbed	70	72	50	39.28	32	32	17.39	13.04
	damaged	10	0	7.14	14.28	12	12	17.39	13.04
	troubled+	20	16	32.14	32.14	36	36	34.78	39.13
	others (unsettled)	0	6	0	3.57	0	0	4.34	0
16	involved	72	74	50	50	40	40	26.08	26.08
	implicated+	14	14	25	28.7	48	48	73.91	73.91
	included+	6	6	25	21.42	12	12	0	0
	others (showed)	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0

17 goods	76	80	50	53.57	44	40	34.78	34.78
things	6	0	7.14	7.14	0	0	0	0
items	4	0	10.71	3.57	0	0	0	0
products+	10	10	17.85	21.42	20	20	21.73	21.73
merchandises+	4	10	14.28	14.28	36	40	43.47	43.47
18 give back	64	68	57.14	50	44	40	30.43	30.43
pay back	14	14	10.71	17.85	20	24	13.04	13.04
return+	10	10	14.28	21.42	20	16	17.39	17.39
reimburse+	4	4	7.14	10.71	16	20	39.13	39.13
others (bring)	8	4	10.71	0	0	0	0	0
19 deeply	84	94	71.42	71.42	56	60	30.43	30.43
sound	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
profoundly+	8	4	28.57	28.57	44	40	69.56	69.56
20 car	96	94	82.14	82.14	68	72	43.47	43.47
vehicle+	4	6	17.85	17.85	32	28	56.52	56.52
21 carelessness	80	82	50	53.57	48	48	34.78	30.43
negligence+	8	10	35.71	35.71	40	40	60.86	60.86
neglect+	4	2	14.28	10.71	12	12	4.34	8.69
others (betrayal, wrong doing)	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
22 begins	80	88	39.28	42.85	40	40	47.82	47.82
starts	20	12	46.42	42.85	44	44	21.73	21.73
commences+	0	0	14.28	14.28	16	16	30.43	30.43
23 left	70	72	60.71	57.14	48	40	26.73	26.08
gave up	6	12	3.57	10.71	8	12	4.34	8.69
abandoned+	16	14	32.13	32.13	44	44	69.56	65.21
others (forsook)	8	2	3.57	0	0	4	4.34	0
24 team	88	88	82.14	82.14	80	76	73.91	73.91
club	6	6	3.57	3.57	4	4	4.34	4.34
formation+	6	6	14.28	14.28	16	20	21.73	21.73
25 end	70	88	53.57	75	48	64	47.82	47.82
begin/start	22	0	14.28	0	12	0	0	0
finish+	8	12	21.42	14.28	24	20	30.43	30.43
terminate+	0	0	10.71	10.71	16	16	21.73	21.73
26 surrendered+	14	14	39.28	32.14	40	36	43.47	43.47
withdrew	48	54	25	25	20	20	17.28	13.04
gave up	28	22	0	10.71	8	4	4.34	0
capitulated+	8	8	25	28.57	28	36	34.78	39.13
others (lost)	2	2	10.71	3.57	4	4	0	4.34
27 introduce	26	20	53.57	57.14	76	76	82.60	86.95
show	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
present+	58	76	35.71	42.85	20	24	17.39	13.04
others (name)	8	2	10.71	0	4	0	0	0

12

28 take	42	44	32.14	32.14	32	36	21.73	21.73
use	20	20	17.85	17.85	4	4	8.69	8.69
have	18	16	10.71	7.14	16	8	8.69	8.69
occupy+	16	18	32.14	42.85	48	52	56.52	60.86
others (fill)	4	2	7.14	0	0	0	4.34	0
29 bring	34	32	7.14	0	12	4	8.69	0
give	42	48	25	14.28	20	28	13.04	26.08
hand	8	6	3.57	7.14	0	0	0	0
pass+	16	14	64.28	78.57	68	68	78.26	73.91
30 explain	92	100	85.71	85.71	76	80	78.26	78.26
explicate+	0	0	10.71	14.28	20	20	21.73	21.73
others (grasp)	8	0	3.57	0	4	0	0	0

2. 5. 2 Experiment 2 : lexico-semantic acceptability judgment task (see Appendix C)

The subjects were presented with complete sentences containing a cognate word. The cognate, which was underlined, was appropriately used in some cases and in some other cases it was not. In other words, the experiment included sentences where the cognates were used according to their English meaning and others where they were used incorrectly, that is, according to their French meaning. The subjects' task consisted of giving their acceptability judgment for each case, that is, whether they accepted the use of the cognate as appropriate or did not. Since there were cases where the subjects might have felt uncertain about the acceptability of the use of the cognates, a yes/no or acceptable/unacceptable answer would have failed to show this indeterminacy. Therefore they were given a scale of five points along which they could rank their judgments. Point 5 meant completely acceptable, point 1 meant completely unacceptable and 4, 3, and 2 were intermediate points. Twenty-eight items used in this experiment relate to the first hypothesis, that is, use of non-cognate English words rather than French-English cognates. The other twenty-two relate to the use of cognates whose meanings differ in French and in English.

Results

The table below presents the average means of the answers given by the subjects in each class. The figures correspond to the subjects' tendency to accept (if close to 5) or not to accept (if close to 1) the use of each item.

	year 1 (50 subjects)	year 2 (28 subjects)	year 3 (25 subjects)	year 4 (23 subjects)
1 veterinary*	4.28	3.143	3.07	3.09
2 demanded	2.28	2.428	2.96	3.391
3 ignore	2.12	2.464	2.6	2.913
4 remarked	1.8	2.428	2.92	3.043
5 attained	2.14	2.464	2.76	3.174
6 attended	1.7	2.25	2.44	2.826
7 termination	1.82	2.214	2.6	3.00
8 devastated	1.82	2.25	2.64	3.261
9 succeeded	1.82	2.25	2.6	3.304

10 cautioned	1.82	2.25	2.56	2.913
11 administrates	2.38	2.428	2.76	3.304
12 saluted	2.28	2.464	2.92	3.478
13 commended	1.8	1.964	2.64	2.695
14 fatigued	2.06	2.607	2.64	3.130
15 venue	1.8	2.214	2.56	2.869
16 nominated	1.9	2.25	2.56	2.826
17 sympathetic	1.9	2.214	2.48	2.695
18 reprimand	2.28	2.392	2.96	3.434
19 ameliorate	2.18	2.464	2.84	3.478
20 inexcusable	1.86	2.357	2.68	3.130
21 recompense	1.86	2.464	2.8	3.434
22 entourage	1.94	2.392	2.76	3.434
23 theatre	1.82	2.285	2.44	2.695
24 grave	1.86	2.285	2.55	3.043
25 interests*	3.48	3.25	2.92	2.347
26 liberty	2.46	2.357	3.28	3.391
27 siege*	3.50	3.142	3.00	2.609
28 massive	2.38	2.392	2.56	3.217
29 necessitated	2.00	2.464	2.88	3.478
30 aid	1.9	2.214	2.6	3.347
31 estimate*	4.1	3.785	3.28	3.00
32 agenda*	4.76	4.179	3.00	2.695
33 depose	1.88	2.214	2.88	3.434
34 promenaded	1.6	1.785	2.56	3.086
35 comprehend 1	2.04	2.357	2.8	3.130
36 persuaded*	4.26	4.142	3.36	3.217
37 revenue	2.18	2.464	2.56	3.304
38 authoritative*	4.76	4.142	4.12	3.347
39 comprehend 2	2.08	1.928	2.6	2.695
40 alleges*	4.28	3.857	3.68	3.260
41 assassin	1.8	2.321	2.56	3.130
42 pardoned	1.9	2.285	2.52	3.086
43 function	2.00	2.321	2.4	2.869
44 actuality*	4.00	3.25	2.92	2.826
45 menace	1.72	2.464	2.96	3.391
46 guardian	2.00	2.392	2.56	3.478
47 concussion*	3.98	3.57	3.36	3.260
48 chanting	1.9	2.464	2.8	3.478
49 administered	1.80	2.214	2.428	2.695
50 formidable	1.6	1.928	2.56	3.086

Note: The words marked with a * are unacceptable in the contexts they are supplied in the experiment.

2. 5. 3 Discussion of the results

In the first experiment, all the items except number 10, 13, 14, and 27 relate to the hypotheses that the subjects will show a tendency to use non-cognate English lexemes which are in a relation of either synonymy or hyponymy with French-English cognates rather than the latter (hypothesis 1) and that this tendency will decrease with the increase in the subjects' level of proficiency (hypothesis 3). The four remaining items (number 10, 13, 14, and 27) correspond to the hypotheses that the subjects will show a tendency to transfer French-English cognates whose meanings differ between French and English (hypothesis 2) and that this tendency will decrease with the increase in the subjects' level of proficiency (hypothesis 3).

Regarding the first and third hypotheses, the evidence from the results rests on the comparison of the percentage of the subjects who used French-English cognates with the percentage of the subjects who used non-cognate English words and the comparison of the subjects' answers according to their level of proficiency. The first step is to identify which items among the answers given by the subjects are French-English cognates and which ones are non-cognate English words. We shall regard as French-English cognates all the items whose form is entirely or partially similar in French and English. These are distinguished in the table by a +. It should be noted, however, that there is no systematic way of measuring formal similarity, although common roots and affixes are reliable indicators of formal similarity between cognate pairs. On the other hand, we regard as non-cognate English words all the items which have no counterparts in French which are entirely or partially similar to them in form.

Overall, two important observations arise from the results in both version one (V1) and version two (V2) :

The subjects' answers are mostly non-cognate English words which are in a relation of either synonymy or hyponymy with the French-English cognates in question. However, the percentage of the subjects who used non-cognate English words decreases from left to right, i.e. from first year to fourth year, while the percentage of the subjects who used French-English cognates rises from right to left, i.e. from fourth year to first year. For example, in sentence number one, 60% and 64% of first year subjects used *misunderstanding* and *break* respectively in V1 and V2, while only 50% and 42.85% of second year subjects, 36% and 40% of third year subjects, and 21.73% and 34.78% of fourth year subjects did so. In the same sentence, 39.28% and 47.82% of fourth year subjects used *rupture* respectively in V1 and V2 whereas only 20% and 36% of third year subjects, 14.28% and 35.71% of second year subjects, and 4% and 6% of first year subjects used it. In sentence two, 80% and 78% of first year subjects used *spying* respectively in V1 and V2 where 71.42% of second year subjects , 56% and 48% of third year subjects, and 43.47% of fourth year students used it. Conversely, 56.52% of fourth year subjects used *espionage* rather than *spying* respectively in V1 and V2 where 40% and 44% of third year subjects, 21.42% and 28.58% of second year subjects, and 10% and 16% of first year subjects did so. The same kinds of proportions are observed in all the twenty six sentences. Therefore the results of the experiment support hypotheses one and three.

Regarding the four other items which relate to cognates whose meanings differ in French and in English, the subjects tend to transfer their French knowledge of the cognates into English but this tendency decreases with the increase in the subjects' level of proficiency. In sentence number ten, for instance, 72% and 66% of first year subjects used *experiences* where 46.42% and 39.28% of second year subjects, 28% of third year subjects, and 13.04% and 8.69% of fourth year subjects did so respectively in V1 and V2, whereas all the remaining subjects used *experiments*.The same observation applies to *caution* in sentence 13, *physicians* in sentence 14, and *present* in sentence 27. These results support hypotheses two and three.

The effect of French prompts in V2

As had been anticipated, in some cases, a number of subjects misunderstood or misinterpreted the sentences, this resulting in the subjects' failing to use the word which was expected, particularly in the version without French prompts. The subjects' answers

in the version with French prompts did not significantly alter the subjects' tendency to use non-cognate English words rather than French-English cognates or to transfer cognates whose meanings differ in French and in English, although the figures in V1 and V2 are different for some items. The French prompts simply made it easier for the subjects to use the words expected but they also seem to have increased the subjects' likelihood of using French-English cognates rather than non-cognate English words. The words which changed the intended meaning of the sentences belong to the category of 'others' in the results table. In any case, they are so few as to bear no significance for the results of the experiment.

The second experiment comprises two categories of items :

(a) French-English cognates whose meanings are the same or similar in French and English : *demand, remark, attain, termination, devastated, administrate, salute, fatigued, reprimand, ameliorate, inexcusable, recompense, entourage, grave, liberty, massive, necessitate, aid, depose, promenade, comprehend 1, revenue, comprehend 2, assassin, pardon, menace, chant, and formidable.*

(b) French-English cognates whose meanings differ in French and in English : *veterinary, ignore, attend, succeed, caution, commend, venue, nominate, sympathetic, theatre, function, interest, siege, estimate, agenda, persuaded, authoritative, allege, actuality, guardian, concussion, and administer.*

The results of the experiment indicate that, for the first category of cognates, the mean of the subjects' rating of their acceptability rises from left to right, i.e. from first year to fourth year. They also indicate that all first and second year subjects rated their acceptability below 2.5 (except for *fatigued*), all third year subjects between 2.5 and 3 (except for *liberty*), and all fourth year subjects between 3 and 3.5 (except for *comprehend* 2). Yet all the items were acceptably used according to five native speakers (all applied linguists) whom I asked to give their acceptability judgments of the items to confirm my own intuitions, prior to running the experiment. Interpreted in the light of the stated hypotheses, the results suggest that the subjects tend to reject or avoid using French-English cognates whose meanings are the same or similar and that this tendency decreases with the increase in the students' level of proficiency.

Under the category of cognates whose meanings differ in French and in English, we have included false friends (e.g. *venue, sympathetic*), polysemous words (e.g. (*succeed, theatre*), and synforms (same lexical forms) or confusable pairs (e.g. *authoritative/authoritarian, estimate/esteem*). Laufer (1988, 1989) refers to this category as 'deceptively transparent words'. The results of the experiment show that those which were appropriately used, or to put it differently, those which were used in agreement with their English meaning, were poorly rated by the subjects from all the four classes (e.g. *ignore* : 2.12, 2.464, 2.6, and 2.913; *attended* : 1.7, 2.25, 2.44, and 2.826; *cautioned* : 1.82, 2.25, 2.56, and 2.913; *venue* : 1.8, 2.214, 2.56, and 2.869; etc.), whereas the ones which were inappropriately used, or to put it differently, those which were used compatibly with their French meaning but incompatibly with their English meaning, were highly rated by the subjects from all the four classes (e.g. *interest* : 3.48, 3.25, 2.92, and 2.347; *siege* : 3.50, 3.142; 3, and 2.260; *agenda* : 4.76, 4.179, 3, 2.695; *persuaded* : 4.26, 4.142, 3.36, and 3.217; *alleges* : 4.24, 3.857, 3.68, and 3.260). The subjects' acceptability judgments seem to have depended on whether or not the meaning of the words in the contexts they were used in coincided with or differed from the one they assign to the words in French. With polysemous cognates,

for instance, they seem to have assumed that succeed means only 'manage to', that theatre has to do with only 'plays', that administer has only to do with 'manage' or 'run', and they substituted interest for 'profit' as they belong to the same semantic field although they do not mean the same thing.

Among confusable pairs, *veterinary* was taken for 'veterinarian' because they both have the same French equivalent 'vétérinaire' and was highly rated by all the groups (4.28, 3.143, 3.07, and 3.09), *estimate* (3.82, 3.785, 3.25, and 3) was confused with 'esteem' because they share the same French equivalent 'estimer', and *authoritative* was confused with 'authoritarian' because they are both related to the French word 'autorité' (authority) and was highly rated by the subjects from all the four classes (4.76, 4.142, 4.12, and 3.347). However, whether the subjects tend to accept or reject the use of the cognates, the results of the experiment show that this tendency decreases with the increase in the subjects' level of proficiency. Therefore the results support hypotheses two and three.

2. 5. 4 Interpretation of the Results

There are at least three possible reasons for the learners' avoiding using cognate words whose meanings are the same or similar in French and English. They may be doing so because they feel that the non-cognate English words semantically represent the concepts they stand for more precisely than cognate words do; or because they are deliberately adopting an avoidance or non-transfer strategy, especially when they lack confidence about the acceptability and appropriateness of French-English cognates; or else because they simply do not know the correct usage of the cognates in English (ignorance).

On the other hand, to explain why French-English cognates whose meanings differ between French and English seem to present more difficulties to the learners, one has to look at the hierarchy of difficulty involved in learning word meanings. In this particular case, the difficulty can be described as learning new meanings for known words, on the one hand, and learning new formal representations for known words, on the other hand. In other words, the subjects already know the words and their meanings in French but have to realise that these words denote different concepts in English; again, even if the concepts that the words denote in English are already known to the learners, they have the task of learning new labels for those concepts. And although the learners already know these labels in French, they also have the task of learning the differences between the labels (orthographic, morphemic, grammatical, etc.) in French and in English. Therefore such words are a potential source of difficulty. This difficulty is twofold because it involves expanding the meanings of words that the students already know in the source language (in this case, French) by acquiring additional meanings that the words have in the target language (in this case, English) and learning to differentiate between two formal representations (the French and the English) of the same underlying word. The question which remains unanswered is, however, how the forms and meanings of such cognates are stored and coexist in the mental lexicon and what processes are involved in accessing and retrieving them while performing in either language. From a semantic point of view, cognates whose meanings differ between language x and language y can be described as 'cross-linguistic polysemous items', with the implication that the difficulty involved in learning and using 'intra-linguistic polysemous items' also applies to cross-linguistic polysemous items.

Since the subjects who took part in the experiments belonged to four different groups (first, second, third, and fourth years), it was useful to observe whether there was any significant variation in their performance behaviour. It was predicted that the subjects' tendencies to use synonymous or hyponymous non-cognates rather than French-English cognates and to transfer French-English cognates whose meanings differ in French and English would both decrease with the increase in the subjects' level of proficiency. This appears to be borne out by the data. The reason for this variation in the subjects' behaviour is twofold. On the one hand, learners' performance in the target language is naturally expected to improve as their level of proficiency increases. On the other hand, we can explain the variation in the specific area of lexis in terms of the organisation of the bilingual lexicon and the principles of word recognition and retrieval which continue to undergo some restructuring along the target language developmental route in such a way that bilingual individuals with different levels of proficiency in the target language presumably have their mental lexicon organised differently and use different word recognition and retrieval models.

In terms of language learning theory, the above results imply that the level of proficiency is an important factor which influences the learners' performance in the target language. On the one hand, it is often argued that beginning or less advanced learners are biassed towards the source language and are attracted to formal similarity but are less successful in working out semantic similarity in cognate pairs, whereas advanced learners make target language-based associations. In other words, advanced learners make semantic associations within the target language. This may also imply that as learners progress and their confidence in the target language grows, they gradually move away from the source language and possibly start 'thinking' in the target language. On the other hand, the results of this study show that this is not always the case. For example, as far as French-English cognates are concerned, it appears that the proficiency factor interacts with the category of cognates being considered. In terms of communication efficiency, the subjects' use of synonymous or hyponymous alternatives to the cognates may result in lack of communicative precision as a consequence of semantic approximations. For instance, a hyponym and its superordinate counterpart do not cover the same area of meaning and would not be interchanged in most contexts without resulting in semantic imprecision and communicative inaccuracy.

3. Further implications for SLA

From the above observations, it appears that the subjects are suspicious of some categories of cognates but not of others. First, they tend to avoid using French-English cognates which have synonymous or hyponymous non-cognate English alternatives and to use the latter instead. Second, they tend to transfer more readily French-English cognates whose meanings differ in French and in English. Does this suggest that the first category is perceived as less transferable than the second category by the learners? Does it suggest that the learners use different recognition and retrieval strategies for different categories of cognates? Is it the case that different categories of cognates may be arranged in different sub-components of the mental lexicon? Does it suggest that bilingual individuals have two separate mental lexicons and that some categories of cognates are incorporated in one of the two lexicons whereas some other categories are incorporated in the other lexicon? And if bilingual individuals have only one common lexicon for both languages, what are the underlying factors which determine some cognates being more transferable than others? Does it also imply that the notions of psychotypology and language distance interplay with other factors such as the linguistic

(in this case, lexical) categories being considered, the semantic relations holding between lexical items, and the learners' level of proficiency? Is it therefore insufficient to assume that the learners' perception of the distance between the source language and the target language will automatically boost or depress the likelihood of transferability? And finally, does it imply that different strategies need be used to teach different categories of cognates? It is these questions that make French-English lexical cognates an interesting and important area of investigation, and it is an awareness of the relevance of these questions that has motivated the present study.

4. Conclusion

It appears from this study that the strong belief among SLA researchers working on lexical transfer (e.g. Haastrup,1989; Ringbom, 1987) that 'we do well in letting learners understand that lexical transfer is overwhelmingly positive ... when the L1 and L2 in question are related ... ' is valid only with regard to some lexical categories. The transferability of French-English cognates largely varies in accordance with the lexical categories, the semantic relations holding between cognate pairs/sets and the learners' level of proficiency. This study provides further evidence for L2 influence on L3, but I believe that more studies should be carried out to confirm other cases of L2-L3, or even L3-L4, influence before this research area can gain more ground.

References

Ahukana J., N. Lund and J.R. Gentile. 1981. 'Inter- and intra-lingual interference effects in learning a third language'. Modern Language Journal 65 : 281-87.

Andersen R.W. 1984. Second Languages : A Crosslinguistic Perspective. Rowley, Mass. : Newbury House.

Bentahila A. 1975. 'The Influence of L2 on the Learning of L3'. M.A Dissertation. University College of North Wales, Bangor.

Chandrasekhar A. 1978. 'Base language'. IRAL 16/1 : 62-5.

Chi-wei T. 1983. Towards an Explication and Description of Synonymy in English'. Ph.D Thesis. University of Edinburgh.

Chumbow B.S. 1981. 'The mother tongue hypothesis in a multicultural setting' in J.G. Savard and L. Laforge (eds.) 1981 : 42-55.

Corder S.P. 1979. 'Language distance and the magnitude of the learning task'. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 2/1 : 27-36.

Haastrup K. 1989. 'The learner as word processor'. AILA Review 6 : 34-46.

Haggis B.M. 1973. 'Un cas de trilinguisme'. La Linguistique 9/ 2 : 37-50.

James J. 1977. 'Language transfer reconsidered'. Interlanguage Studies Bulletin 2/3 : 7-21.

Kellerman E. 1977. 'Towards a characterisation of the strategy of transfer in second language learning'. Interlanguage Studies Bulletin 2(1) : 58-146.

Kellerman E. 1986. 'An eye for an eye : cross-linguistic constraints on the development of the L2 lexicon' in E.Kellerman and M.Sharwood Smith (eds.) 1986 : 35-48.

Kellerman E. 1987. 'Aspects of Transferability in Second Language Acquisition'. Ph.D Thesis. University of Nijmegen.

Kellerman E. and M. Sharwood (eds.). 1986. Crosslinguistic Influence in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford : Pergamon Press.

Khaldi K. 1981. 'The Use of the Strategy of Transfer by Learners with a Bilingual Background'. M.Litt Thesis. University of Edinburgh.

Laufer B. 1988. 'The concept of synforms (similar lexical forms) in vocabulary acquisition'. Language and Education 2/2 : 113-32.

Laufer B. 1989. 'A factor of difficulty in vocabulary learning : Deceptive transparency'. AILA Review 6 : 10-20.

Lightbown P.M. and G. Libben. 1984 'The recognition and use of cognates by L2 learners' in R.W. Andersen (ed.) 1984 : 393-418.

Lyons J. 1981. Language, Meaning and Context. London : Fontana.

Meisel, J. 1983. 'Transfer as a second language strategy'. Language and Communication 3 : 11-46.

Nababan P.W.J. 1971. 'A note on transfer and interference in foreign language learning'. Working Papers in Linguistics 3/4 : 17-24. Department of Linguistics, University of Hawaii.

Ringbom H. 1978. The influence of the mother tongue on the translation of lexical items'. Interlanguage Studies Bulletin 3/1 : 80-101.

Ringbom H. 1983. 'Borrowing and lexical transfer'. Applied Linguistics 4(3) : 207-12.

Ringbom H. 1986. 'Crosslinguistic influence and the foreign language learning process' in E. Kellerman and M. Sharwood (eds.) 1986 : 150-162.

Ringbom H. 1987. The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters.

Rivers W.M. 1979. 'Learning a sixth language : an adult learner's daily dairy'. Canadian Modern Language Review 36/1 : 67-82.

Savard J.G. and L. Laforge (eds). 1981. Proceedings of the 5th Conference of l'Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée. Quebec : Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Schachter J., A.F. Tyson and F.J. Diffley. 1986. 'Learner intuitions of grammaticality. Language Learning 26/1 : 67-76.

Singh R. and S. Carroll. 1979. 'L1, L2, and L3'. Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics 5/1 : 51-63.

Sweet H. 1964. The Practical Study of Languages. London : Oxford University Press.

Tenjoh-Okwen T. 1985. 'An Analysis of Some Aspects of the Interlanguage of Francophone Cameroonian Learners of English. Ph.D Thesis. Department of English : University of Ibadan.

Thomas J. 1988. 'The role played by metalinguistic awareness in second and third language learning'. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 9/3 : 235-46.

Uljin J.M., S. Wolfe and A. Donn. 1981. 'The Lexical Transfer Effect of French Knowledge in the Acquisition of English by Native Vietnamese Speakers'. Report No.6 F.L.A. Research THE, Eindhoven University of Technology.

Vildomec V. 1963. Multilingualism. Leyden : Sythoff.

Wickstrom Y. 1980. 'Mother Tongue Interference and Third Language Interference with Special Reference to Finns Learning Swedish and English'. M.A Dissertation. Abo Akademi : Department of English.

White L. 1987. 'Markedness and second language acquisition : the question of transfer'. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 9 : 261-85.

Appendices

A. Sentence Completion Task (Version 1)

Complete the following sentences with the missing word. The information supplied in each sentence will help to choose the appropriate word. Only one word answers should be given and you should not give any word already used in the sentence as your answer. Do not hesitate to ask me if there is a word used in the sentences that you do not understand.

1 There must have been a ..... in their friendship because I have not seen them together for ten months. The problem is that they do not want to tell anyone the truth.

2 Two Americans were deported from Iraq after it was found out that they worked for the CIA but they insisted that they were not involved in .....

(The remaining items were exactly as in Version 2 below, without the French prompts.)

B. Sentence Completion Task (Version 2)

Complete the following sentences with the appropriate missing word. The French translation of the missing word has been provided to help you. **Only one word answers** should be given. Do not hesitate to ask me if there is a word used in the sentences that you do not understand.

1 There must have been a ..... in their friendship because I have not seen them together for ten months. The problem is that they do not want to tell anyone the truth (rupture).

2 Two Americans were deported from Iraq after it was found out that they worked for the CIA but they insisted that they were not involved in..... (espionnage)

3 He loves food so much that everyone is amazed at his ..... Even his own children have to keep away from him while he is eating (gourmandise).

4 He ..... his work to eat lunch (interrompre)

5 He can now build a house because he has got a £100,000 bank .....(crédit)

6 What is the best and shortest ..... from here to Switzerland? (route)

7 Two bombs exploded shortly before the ..... of the cabinet meeting while the ministers were still waiting for the Prime Minister (commencement).

8 Prince Rwagasore was ..... by the enemies of Uprona (assassiné).

9 Kuwait was ..... by the Allies after seven months of occupation (libéré).

10 He performed a lot of ..... in the laboratory (expériences).

11 He ..... all his money in the bank and forgot to keep some for the weekend shopping (déposer).

12 All the athletes were suffering from ..... at the end of the marathon race. They were all exhausted (fatigue).

13 Our landlady asked for a £50 ..... to cover any damage we might cause during our stay (caution).

14 Our University does not have enough ..... because very few students are attracted to the Department of Physics. But it has a lot of mathematicians (physiciens).

15 His mind became ..... as a result of his long imprisonment (dérangé).

16 The criminal's statements ..... a local politician in the crime (impliquer).

17 The store sells ..... from all over the world. It sells very few items which are local products (marchandises).

18 You promised to ..... all the money I paid for your clothes and you cannot change your mind now (rembourser).

19 He was so ..... asleep that he completely could not hear the fire alarm (profondément).

20 You should not buy this ..... because it has already been involved in several accidents. Besides,you said you would prefer a Ford to a Peugeot (véhicule).

21 She was found guilty of ..... because she did not look after her children properly. Her irresponsibility was condemned by many parents (négligence).

22 In Britain the academic year ..... in October just like in Burundi (commencer).

23 The thieves ..... the car they had stolen on the road and ran away while the police were following them (abandonner).

24 Inter Star is the most experienced football ..... in Burundi (formation).

25 The cabinet meeting will ..... at five o'clock. So the Prime Minister will not be available until that time (se terminer).

26 The Iraqi troops ..... on the 43rd day of the Gulf War, which was the day the war ended (capituler).

27 The chairman of the conference forgot to ..... the speakers to the audience (présenter).

28 Please do not ..... this seat because it has been reserved (occuper).

29 While we were eating lunch, my brother asked me to ..... him the salt (passer).

30 He tried hard to .....his theory to the experts who attended his lecture (expliquer).

C. Lexico-Semantic Acceptability Judgment

Using a scale of 5 points, indicate the degree to which you accept the underlined words as appropriately used. Along the scale point 5 means completely acceptable, 1 means completely unacceptable and 4, 3, and 2 are intermediate points. Give your answer by putting a **cross** in only one of the five boxes.

1 My brother is a <u>veterinary</u>. He is a doctor for animals.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

2 The Allies <u>demanded</u> that Iraq accept all the 12 UN resolutions.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

3 If you <u>ignore</u> my advice, you will regret it later on.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

4 The Finance Minister <u>remarked</u> that the country's economy was in recession.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

5 He has just attained the age of twenty.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

6 His fiancée attended him all through his illness.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

7 The termination of hostilities in the Gulf War was awaited by many people all over the world.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

8 The army commander was devastated by the news that 50 of his soldiers had been killed by friendly fire.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

9 Mr Major succeeded Mrs Thatcher as the Prime Minister of the U.K.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

10 The referee cautioned the player three times before he sent him off.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

11 Who administrates your financial affairs?
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

12 Prime Minister Major saluted the courage and conduct of the British troops during the Gulf War.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

13 President Bush commended the US forces for their brilliant victory.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

14 If you got too fatigued, your heart would get worse.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

15 Which ground is the venue for the next football match?
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

16 The club members have nominated a new president.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

17 She was very sympathetic when I failed my exam.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

18 His father gave him a serious reprimand for damaging his car.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

19 You will not ameliorate the situation by giving a long explanation.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

20 His behaviour is inexcusable.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

21 He received a large sum of money as recompense for stealing the enemy's war plan.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

22 In many countries, leaders are overthrown by their own entourage.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

23 The patient died in the theatre while he was being operated upon.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

24 The British Government expressed its grave concern about the treatment of POWs (Prisoners Of War) by the Iraqi Government.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

25 The company made large interests from exports.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

26 Children have a lot more liberty now than they used to.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

27 The siege for the United Nations is in New York.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

28 The song will undoubtedly become a massive hit.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

29 The situation necessitated his immediate return.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

30 I can aid you in your research by providing you with some data.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

31 British people still estimate Mrs Thatcher as an outstanding politician.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

32 She has bought a nice 1992 agenda.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

33 The Iraqi army should depose Saddam Hussein for the good of the country.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

34 She promenaded her children through the park.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

35 It is difficult to comprehend the behaviour of that man.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

36 I am persuaded that multiparty systems do not necessarily mean democracy.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

37 Much of the government's revenue comes from exports.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

38 He is such an authoritative father that no child can object to his decisions.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

39 His lecture comprehended several aspects of the topic.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

40 Although this medicine does not cure the illness, it alleges the pain.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

41 The assassin of Gandhi is still unknown.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

42 The President pardoned all the political prisoners.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

43 The function was attended by many dignitaries.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

44 Multiparty system is an important actuality in African politics today.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

45 Large lorries are a menace on narrow roads.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

46 He became the child's guardian when her parents were killed in a car crash.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

47 The customs officer was found guilty of concussion.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

48 Iraqi demonstrators were chanting slogans against President Bush.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

49 The doctor administered the drugs to that patient.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

50 The problem he is faced with is formidable.
5[ ]4[ ]3[ ]2[ ]1[ ]

25